

In April, job losses were widespread except in retail and government, which added to their payrolls.

The unemployment numbers follow the Federal Reserve's surprise interest rate cut by one-half point last month—the fourth reduction this year in the Fed's campaign to ward off recession. Analysts have said further rate cuts are likely at the central bank's May 15 meeting.

With unemployment expected to continue inching up, some economists worry that consumers might rein in spending and further weaken the struggling economy.

Consumer spending accounts for two-thirds of all economic activity and has helped buoy the economy during the downturn.

Some companies are coping by sharply cutting production, leading to reductions in workers' hours and overtime, and forcing thousands of layoffs.

The New York Times announced this week that it would cut 100 jobs after already laying off 100 people at its online unit and offering buyouts to other employees. That followed recent announcements at Morgan Stanley, Honeywell International Inc., LM Ericsson and Texas Instruments Inc.

Friday's report showed that manufacturing, which has been bearing the brunt of the economic slowdown, continued to hemorrhage, losing a huge 104,000 jobs last month. Declines since June have totaled 554,000 and two-thirds of those job losses have occurred in the past four months.

Construction, which had been adding jobs over the last several months, lost 64,000 jobs in April. The government said the drop may reflect in part heavy rains over part of the country. The construction and housing businesses have remained healthy during the economic slowdown—a key force in keeping the economy out of recession.

Business services cut 121,000 jobs in April. Temporary employment services experienced another sharp decline of 108,000 last month, and have lost 370,000 jobs since September.

Seasonal hiring in amusement and recreation services and hotels was well below normal last month, with unemployment declines of 30,000 and 13,000, respectively.

Average hourly earnings, a key gauge of inflation, rose by 0.4 percent in April to \$14.22 an hour. That matched the gain in March. The length of the average workweek was unchanged at 34.3 hours in April.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I will speak about the education bill.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. About how long will the Senator speak, so I know when to return.

Mr. GREGG. I say to the Senator, I will probably speak 15 to 20 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

#### BETTER EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS AND TEACHERS ACT—Continued

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, we have discussed at considerable length the educational issues that have been brought forward by the BEST bill, which is the proposal that came out of the Health Committee I serve on, chaired by Senator JEFFORDS from Vermont, and ranking member Senator KENNEDY from Massachusetts. We

talked a lot about policy and the fact this bill moves the policy forward to try to reform our school systems in a number of ways. It does not necessarily go as far as some Members would like, but it is progress in areas which are in significant need of progress.

I have had a chance to speak about the need for more choice, the need for basic themes such as being child centered, flexibility, has academic achievement as its goal especially for low-income kids, and it has accountability standards to make sure the academic standards are met.

I have spoken on a number of specific issues such as how to deal with teachers, how it improves the capacity of local school districts to do more to get and keep good teachers and hire good teachers.

I will speak about the issue of the funding in this bill and the funding question generally because there has been a lot of discussion especially from the other side of the aisle about how inappropriate the funding levels are that the President has proposed to support the educational reforms he has requested.

When I hear these representations from the other side of the aisle, I am not so sure they come to the table—not to be too aggressive—with clean hands on the issue. The issue of funding education in this country, especially things such as special education, has been debated for the last few years and it has been the Republican side of the aisle that has significantly increased the commitments to educational funding. I think it is appropriate to review the history of where we are in the area of funding.

First, it is most important to point out the equation for better education is not more dollars equal better education. Over and over again it has been shown, in study after study, that more dollars do not produce better education. The key to better education is a much more complex formula than some would have Members believe. Those who suggest we put more dollars in and we get better education are wrong. The key to education is a formula that involves, No. 1, parental involvement; No. 2, good teachers; No. 3, good principles; No. 4, local control over the curriculum and how the schools teach; and probably No. 5 on the list, dollars. It is a mixture of these factors and other factors, of course—facilities and things like that—but primarily it is a very complex formula. It is not just more dollars means better education.

A number of studies have shown this relative to local dollars and State dollars. Regarding Federal dollars spent, the statistics are especially startling. We have had a Federal program in place now for over 30 years, the purpose of which was to raise the level of academic achievement of especially low-income children. That is what we were focusing on as a Federal Government. Regrettably, our success in this area

has been singularly poor. This chart reflects this. We have spent \$120 billion on title I, which is directed at low-income children. Yet the score levels of our kids who meet this category of educational support has remained absolutely flat for all intents and purposes in reading and math. The spending has gone up dramatically, but the score levels of these children has been flat.

In fact, the average child who comes from a low-income family today, who is in the fourth grade, reads at two grade levels below a peer in that class. That is true not only for the fourth but fifth and sixth, and naturally they fall back as they go into the eighth, ninth, and tenth grade to the point where this group of kids, low-income families and especially minority families from urban areas, are graduating at less than a 50-percent rate from high school, even though we spent all this money.

One thing we know for sure is that putting money into the problem has not resolved it. The issue is, What should we do? We need to reform the system. That is what the President has suggested. Through a lot of hard negotiation and aggressive effort on the part of both sides of the aisle, with Senator KENNEDY and Senator JEFFORDS taking the lead, we have been successful coming forward with a bill which in some ways significantly reforms the system, although it leaves out key elements I would like to see, but it is still a major step in the right direction, especially once the bill is amended by the underlying agreement which was reached between the chairman and the ranking member and other people who negotiated.

Reform is critical if you get something for the dollars spent. Dollars are not the only issue.

Let me simply say the representation by the other side that this administration is not willing to commit the dollars to support reform is inconsistent with the history of what has happened over the last few years and who has been willing to fund what. If you look at the amount of funding which President Clinton suggested we put into the educational system over the 8 years of his administration, recognizing for the first 4 years of his administration he has the deficit, the average amount spent, the average increase, was about 3.3 percent. The biggest increase he suggested in any given year was 3 years ago when he suggested 8 percent. But generally, his increases have been proposed at around 4 percent, 3 percent, 2 percent in the area of spending for education.

President Bush has suggested an increase of 11 percent in his budget, twice, three times what President Clinton proposed in any budget over the last 8 years. He has suggested, and he has made an offer to the other side which would represent a 50-percent increase in spending in title I specifically, the single largest increase ever proposed in this program by a factor of 10, by my calculations.

The simple fact is that the President has been willing to come forward, subject to reform being put in place, and commit the dollars necessary to support those reforms. Remember something about the reform proposals brought forward, even as part of the agreement: There is a lead time to those reforms being put in place. They basically all key off of something called annual yearly progress, which keys off of a testing regime, and the testing regime is not presumed to be effective or completely in place for almost 3 years, probably 4 years. It is not expected, under this bill, that we will attain our goals because it takes so long to ramp up to this type of a situation, for 10 years. Thus, the money that is going into the program this year, the 50 percent increase which the President has been willing to propose, is a huge infusion of money upfront when the reforms are not in place. It is really a downpayment in anticipation of what will happen in reforms.

It is really a sign of good faith on his part to make that type of commitment. He is saying, as President, I am committed to these reforms. I know you have to make the reforms to get decent education and achieve improvement in our education. But I also understand money is going to have to be committed. Even though I am not going to get my reforms immediately, I am willing to put the money upfront, and a significant amount of money, a huge amount of money in the context of what has been done in this area for years.

So this argument from the other side that the money is not there, there is not any money there—I heard the ranking member of the Budget Committee come down this morning and give us an explanation of that—is simply inaccurate. Not only has the President proposed to increase his budget by 11 percent, not only was the budget reported out with an 11 percent increase in it, but he has gone much further and said, on the appropriating accounts, he is willing to make a much more significant increase. And the people on the other side who have been negotiating this matter know that. The President has agreed he will find those dollars within the contents of the budget that has been settled on, huge dollars of increase.

Let's take another subject in which we have heard a lot of talk about money, IDEA, special education. This is something I have been working on for a long time. The Senator in the chair has been working on it for a long time. The Senator from Vermont, the chairman of the committee, has been working on it for a long time. When I came to the Senate, the Federal Government was paying 6 percent of the cost of special education. It had agreed in 1976 that it would pay 40 percent of the cost. So the difference, the difference between 6 percent and 40 percent, was being picked up by the local communities through their tax base or

States through their tax base. Essentially States and local communities were having to support the Federal obligation.

As a result, their resources were being skewed and sent places and being used to support Federal obligations when they might have wanted to use them to do something else at the State level. So a number of us made a conscious effort to change that, and we have made huge progress. We have gone from the Federal Government picking up 6 percent of the cost to the Federal Government today picking up almost 17 percent of the cost; and we are closing in on 20 percent of the cost.

But who is the energizer for this? Did it come from President Clinton? Did these additional efforts in the area of special education come from President Clinton? For 8 years in a row there was essentially no increase sent up here by the Democratic White House to increase special education funding of any significance. Only 1 year did they send anything up with any significance. In fact, in a number of years they essentially flat funded this account.

It was not until we got a Republican Congress that this issue was addressed and began to be addressed aggressively. I have a chart which reflects this rather dramatically. This is 1996, the year the Republican Congress came into being. The red accounts reflect the increase in IDEA funding since that period. As you can see from this bar chart, it has gone up every year since there has been a Republican Congress. In this period, of course, you had a Democratic President.

I suggest you go back and look at the budget submissions that came from the White House during this period. You will see no increase. If this were to track the budget submissions of the White House, those lines would be cut off right there. The increase in special education funding has come as a result of aggressive initiatives coming from this side of the aisle.

The President this year has put in his budget the single largest increase ever proposed by a White House in the area of special education—\$1 billion. So we will now exceed \$7 billion in funding for special education if we follow the President's proposal. Those are real dollars that will significantly relieve the burden of the local communities in the area of education and specifically in the area of special education.

So when we hear this patter from the other side of the aisle that the dollars are not there to support the initiatives which the President has talked about, it is simply inconsistent with the facts. There is no question but that the hundreds of billions of dollars that have been suggested on the other side of the aisle are not there because they were not responsible and they would not resolve the problem.

It was ironic, I have to admit, after 8 years of receiving essentially no increase or only marginal increases in title I funding from a White House con-

trolled by the Democratic Party, that during the first few months, when the White House became controlled by the Republican Party, suddenly the Democratic Party decided they needed a 74 percent increase in funding in 1 year in this account. That was after 8 years of saying they did not really need any type of increase of funding in this account.

Could it be political? I don't think so. But the fact is, the request was made and so far we have heard from the other side that unless that request is met, we will be underfunding these accounts.

The President has proposed, as I said, in his budget and has supported in his budget an 11 percent increase overall in education funding. That is the single largest item of increase in his budget of any account, whether it is defense, NIH, whatever. He has put on the table an extra \$1 billion for special ed funding. And he has made an offer on the appropriating side relative to title I, which would represent a 50 percent increase of title I funding in the first year—the first year, which is not 74 percent, but it is still a pretty darned big number.

My view is that the President has more than gone the distance in putting the money on the table necessary to address the reforms which are in this package. The reforms are good reforms.

Once again, let's remember these reforms have a lead-in time which is fairly significant. The money is actually going to be available before the reforms are in place. So I would say the President is showing really good faith in this exercise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Craig amendment No. 372 is the pending business.

Mr. BYRD. So there is an amendment before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the pending amendment may be set aside temporarily and that I might offer an amendment and hopefully get it acted upon by voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 373 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposes an amendment numbered 373 to amendment No. 358.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent further reading of the amendment be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide assistance to local educational agencies to carry out activities to reduce underage alcohol abuse)

On page 586, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

**SEC. 405. GRANTS TO REDUCE ALCOHOL ABUSE.**

Title IV (20 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

**“PART E—GRANTS TO REDUCE ALCOHOL ABUSE**

**“SEC. 4501. GRANTS TO REDUCE ALCOHOL ABUSE.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, shall award grants, on a competitive basis, to local educational agencies to enable such agencies to develop and implement innovative and effective programs to reduce alcohol abuse in secondary schools.

“(b) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a), a local educational agency shall prepare and submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including—

“(1) a description of the activities to be carried out under the grant;

“(2) an assurance that such activities will include 1 or more of the proven strategies for reducing underage alcohol abuse as determined by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration;

“(3) an explanation of how activities to be carried under the grant that are not described in paragraph (2) will be effective in reducing underage alcohol abuse, including references to the past effectiveness of such activities;

“(4) an assurance that the applicant will submit to the Secretary an annual report concerning the effectiveness of the programs and activities funded under the grant; and

“(5) such other information as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(c) STREAMLINING OF PROCESS FOR LOW-INCOME AND RURAL LEAS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, shall develop procedures to make the application process for grants under this section more user-friendly, particularly for low-income and rural local educational agencies.

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and such sums as may be necessary in each of the 6 subsequent fiscal years.

“(2) RESERVATIONS.—

“(A) SAMHSA.—The Secretary shall reserve 20 percent of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year under paragraph (1) to enable the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration to provide alcohol abuse resources and start-up assistance to local educational agencies receiving grants under this section.

“(B) LOW-INCOME AND RURAL AREAS.—The Secretary shall reserve 25 percent of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year under paragraph (1) to award grants under this section to low-income and rural local educational agencies.”.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the warm springtime weather brings to mind the words of Shakespeare:

From you have I been absent in the spring,  
When proud-pied April, dress'd in all his trim,  
Hath put a spirit of youth in everything.

But, unfortunately, all is not well with many of our youth. While most of

them are shedding their winter coats and playing in the warm sunshine, a shocking number are engaging in some very dangerous behavior, dangerous both to themselves and others. I am speaking of alcohol abuse.

When I say “dangerous behavior,” I am talking about alcohol abuse.

According to a study by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, get this: The extent of alcohol consumption by children ages 9 to 15 is startling, and preventing it must become a national priority.

Consider these facts. Three million children ages 14 through 17 are regular drinkers. Twenty-four percent of eighth graders have used alcohol in the last 30 days.

Let me read that again.

Three million children ages 14 through 17 are regular drinkers.

Where are the parents? They aren't around.

Twenty-four percent of eighth graders have used alcohol in the last 30 days. More than 100,000 12- to 13-year-olds binge drink every month. More than 100,000 youngsters 12 to 13 years old binge drink every month.

Ninth graders who drink are almost twice as likely to attempt suicide than those who do not drink. Moreover, 40 percent of children who begin drinking before the age of 15 will become alcoholics at some point in their lives.

Let me say that again.

Forty percent of children who begin drinking before the age of 18 will become alcoholics at some point in their lives.

America has taken elaborate measures to combat the scourge of drugs. We have financed police and military attacks on the drug problem. But the most favored drug for Americans is alcohol. That is the most favored drug—alcohol. The most commonly abused drug is widely available, and it is cowardly promoted—alcohol. Walk into any liquor store, show your ID card—sometimes you don't even have to do that, I am told—and buy your poison. It is for sale.

On television, for those who watch it—I do very little of it. I watch television very seldomly. I watch it when public television has on a truly good informative movie, such as “Napoleon,” or “The Ten Commandants.” I believe I saw “The Ten Commandments.” I know I saw it. But I believe it was on one of those very good programs on some other network, or a station other than public television. Of course, I don't ask everyone to do what I do or to follow me as an example. I am just saying that as far as television is concerned, I select very carefully the programs that I watch on television.

But on television, sports heroes debate whether a particular type of beer tastes great or less filling.

On television, sports heroes debate whether a particular type of beer tastes great or is less filling.

These commercials send a not-so-subtle message to our young people that

drinking is what adults do, particularly adults who are popular—athletes, for example. Drinking is what adults do. So why don't you do it? If it is all right for adults, it is all right for you young people.

Comedians joke about drunks. But drinking is no joke. And we must make a greater effort to get the word out where it can have the greatest impact. Drinking is no joke.

Don't think that the crisis of youth violence is not connected with alcohol. We talk about alcohol abuse. I will just say alcohol, plain old alcohol. We tippy-toe around about it and call it alcohol abuse. Of course, it is alcohol abuse.

Let me say this in addition. There are many causes of youth violence. The people of this country are concerned about youth violence in the schools and elsewhere. There are many causes of youth violence. But judgment, which is not always very well developed in the young, is clearly impaired by alcohol.

My amendment would authorize \$25 million, which is a very small sum for this purpose, for competitive grants to be awarded to local educational agencies for the purpose of assisting them with the implementation of innovative and effective alcohol abuse prevention programs targeted at children and particularly teenagers.

Out of this amendment, \$5 million would be set aside for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration to provide alcohol abuse resources to the local education agencies, as well as to assist them with the implementation of their program.

The U.S. Department of Education would work jointly with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration to develop the grant application with special attention to the low-income and rural educational agencies.

This program is modeled on the National Awards Recognition Program. That program rewards colleges and universities for innovative and effective alcohol prevention initiatives. The difference, however, is that this amendment would create a program that gives funding to schools to create effective alcohol abuse prevention programs targeted towards high school students.

Now, this is the beautiful month of May. We are heading right into the time when there will be high school commencements all over the country. And all too often we read in the newspapers about what happens after high school commencements in some instances: An automobile full of young people, who have just graduated, perhaps from high school, go out for a drive, they drink, they have beer in the car—may have whiskey in the war—and they end up with their automobile wrapped around a tree. Many of those high school youngsters die on those occasions.

So let us take action now, so that springtimes for decades to come can be

wholesomely enjoyed, and can orient our youth toward futures teeming with possibilities. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Before my colleagues respond, my good friend—and he is my good friend—and he is my favorite Senator on this side of the aisle. I will not say today who my favorite Senator is on the other side of the aisle, but I have no problem doing that when the occasion arises. I have several favorite Senators, but Senator KENNEDY is my favorite of all favorites on this side of the aisle.

Now, you do not win friends by saying things like that, selecting another individual and saying he is your favorite. I like all my colleagues on this side of the aisle, but Senator KENNEDY and I have a long history and a long history of friendship. I have great admiration for him.

But in connection with this amendment, Senator KENNEDY asked me a few days ago, right out of the blue sky, to quote a certain poem. That tests your mettle when somebody asks you to quote a poem right in front of the television camera. And these poems are not easy to quote in situations like that. I am almost tempted, though, to quote that poem in connection with this amendment.

Twas a dangerous cliff, as they freely confessed,

Though to walk near its crest was so pleasant;

But over its terrible edge there had slipped  
A duke and full many a peasant.

So the people said something would have to be done,

But their projects did not at all tally;

Some said, "Put a fence around the edge of the cliff,"

Some, "An ambulance down in the valley."

But the cry for the ambulance carried the day.

For it spread through the neighboring city;  
A fence may be useful or not, it is true,  
But each heart became brimful of pity  
For those who slipped over that dangerous cliff;

And the dwellers in highway and alley  
Gave pounds or gave pence, not to put up a fence,

But an ambulance down in the valley.

"For the cliff is all right, if you're careful," they said,

"And, if folks even slip and are dropping,  
It isn't the slipping that hurts them so much.

As the shock down below when they're stopping."

So day after day, as these mishaps occurred,  
Quick forth would these rescuers sally  
To pick up the victims who fell off the cliff,  
With their ambulance down in the valley.

Then an old sage remarked: "It's a marvel to me

That people give far more attention  
To repairing results than to stopping the cause,

When they'd much better aim at prevention.  
Let us stop at its source all this mischief," cried he,

"Come, neighbors and friends, let us rally;  
If the cliff we will fence we might almost dispense

With the ambulance down in the valley."

"Oh, he's a fanatic," the others rejoined,  
"Dispense with the ambulance? Never!

He'd dispense with all charities, too, if he could;

No! No! We'll support them forever.

Aren't we picking up folks just as fast as they fall?

And shall this man dictate to us? Shall he? Why should people of sense stop to put up a fence,

While the ambulance works down in the valley?"

But a sensible few, who are practical too.

Will not bear with such nonsense much longer;

They believe that prevention is better than cure.

And their party will soon be the stronger.

Encourage them then, with your purse, voice, and pen,

And while other philanthropists dally,

They will scorn all pretense and put up a stout fence

On the cliff that hangs over the valley.

Better guide well the young than reclaim them when old,

For the voice of true wisdom is calling,

"To rescue the fallen is good, but 'tis best

To prevent other people from falling."

Better close up the source of temptation and crime

Than deliver from dungeon or galley;

Better put a strong fence round the top of the cliff

Than an ambulance down in the valley."

That is what this amendment does. It helps—it is not enough—but it helps, it begins a program of putting a fence around the edge of a cliff to rescue these people, prevent their going to the dungeon or galley. I hope that my colleagues will support this amendment, that we might put up a strong fence around the edge of the cliff and keep some of these young people, hopefully, from bringing disaster upon themselves.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, just about a week ago, Senator BYRD was addressing the Senate on a matter of importance, and I took just a moment of his time to ask him if he could refresh our recollection of a poem that he previously recited about the fence and the ambulance down in the valley.

As things would have it, there was intervening business, and the good Senator was kind and patient enough to permit others to proceed. It was late in the afternoon, close to the evening, and Senator BYRD agreed to respond to my request for recitation of this poem at a later time.

Little did I know then that his presentation would have such meaning in connection with the amendment that he offers today, to try to strengthen the academic achievement of children in this country. His amendment is absolutely on point, in that it recognizes that investment in prevention is a much wiser investment than providing remedies after the fact.

Prevention is what the Senator's amendment is really all about. That is the central theme of the Senator's amendment today in terms of awakening awareness among our young people across this country about the extraordinary dangers and devastations of alcohol.

The good Senator from West Virginia is not a member of our Education Com-

mittee, but I am hopeful that in the remaining time the Senate considers the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, at some time the Senator will recall for us the importance of a quality education.

There is no one in this Chamber who can speak more eloquently or more passionately or more knowledgeably than he about the basic importance of starting a young person off on the right path towards academic achievement. And there is no one who can tell the story more effectively about the challenges that are presented to young people, and the resolve they must have in order to earn the legitimate scholarship that results from application of hard work in the development of one's academic abilities.

I do not think there is anyone I know who can remember the names of their third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers, as the Senator from West Virginia can, the subject matter that was taught, and the lessons learned in those classrooms many years ago. I know of no one who can make a more persuasive or passionate statement of support for the importance of a good education as a matter of national priority than the Senator from West Virginia.

I will certainly urge that his amendment be adopted. But more important, I hope that as this body is considering the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and as we get weighted down in the particulars of the legislation, at some time during this period, he might remind us all of the importance of education in a young life and the difference that makes.

He has a remarkable story. I can remember many of the good Senator's speeches. But his past speeches on the importance of a quality education is always one I remember with such clarity and such profundity. It is an extraordinary story. I hope at the end, or sometime during the debate that story of the early educational years of BOB BYRD will remind us all about what we hope this legislation is really about.

We are talking about different features of the legislation this morning, as we did yesterday and we will next week. But Senator BYRD's story brings it all together.

I thank the Senator for bringing this amendment to our attention. I think it adds a very important dimension to this legislation. I hope it will be accepted at this time, if my good friend from Vermont believes it is appropriate to do so.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Again, I commend my good friend from West Virginia on a most eloquent statement. I shall in no way try to match or improve upon what he has said. I strongly believe in what he is trying to do.

Senator KENNEDY has most eloquently expressed his views and thoughts about not only the amendment but the Senator's past. I, for one, admire him every time I hear him speak. It always lifts my day a little bit.

I certainly would accept the amendment. I am checking now to find out from other Members to see if we can do that. We cannot do it at this time.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank both Senators. I hope we can adopt this amendment today. I would be willing to do it on a voice vote if the Senators find it possible.

While I am on my feet, let me say, with the utmost sincerity and gratitude, that the words of my friend, Senator KENNEDY from Massachusetts, are words I shall always recall as long as I live. These words coming from him, and also the words of the Senator from Vermont, are most gratifying.

Senator KENNEDY has led in the fight for better legislation and for more appropriations for the education of our young people. He has been doing this for a long time. When I was majority leader of the Senate several years ago, Senator KENNEDY was one of those committee chairmen. He was almost unique, I would say, but there were one or two others: Scoop Jackson, who was a Senator, and when he came to the floor as chairman of the committee, he had done his homework; he was well prepared. He and Senator KENNEDY were two I can think quickly of as being Senators who turned out legislation which later became the law of the land.

I can remember those days when I would compliment Senator KENNEDY on the work he was doing, and I, from time to time, commented that the legislation he brought from his committee usually became a statute. I can't remember today any Senator who exceeded or who equals the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, in developing language for statutes; I can't think of any Senator who exceeds or even equals Senator KENNEDY in that respect.

It might surprise some people around here to know that in the time I have served, I have yet to find a statute which bears the name of Webster; I have yet to find a statute which is the Clay law; I have yet to find a statute that was authored by John C. Calhoun. Some people judge Senators by the number of laws that bear the Senators' names. That is not the proper standard. When I think of the three greatest Senators of all time, I think of Webster, Calhoun, and Clay because they were great Senators for many reasons. But I find that they were not great Senators because of statutes or laws that bear their name.

But I can find many statutes that became such because of Senator KENNEDY's leadership. And in no area of legislation should one be more proud than that of being a leader in promoting and developing and managing legislation that becomes law. There is nothing better than doing this in the field of education. Those are the best resources for our children.

I am going to accede to Senator KENNEDY's request, if I can, and try to develop a few words that will respond to

his magnificent accolades. I certainly salute him as my leader in the field of education. I thank him for what he said today. I thank him for his service. I thank both Senators for their acceptance of this amendment. I hope we can pass it in the Senate today by a voice vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, again, I thank my friend and colleague for his kind words.

I am also grateful for the Senator's extraordinary service. I say to my colleagues, if they want to find out what a Senator's Senator is all about, travel to West Virginia with BOB BYRD. And if you want to know what the history of this body is, read his lengthy history of this institution.

There are many reasons we are indebted to his service in this institution. There is no one who fights to preserve the institution as Senator BYRD does, and to those of us who love and respect this institution, he stands as Number One. History will not show his equal.

Mr. President, now I want to take a few moments to review a very important aspect of this education debate, and that is the issue of funding for the educational reforms that are before us today.

I ask unanimous consent that this table describing the history of past efforts for funding Title I and other elementary and secondary education programs be printed in the RECORD in refutation of Senator GREGG's statement on education earlier this morning.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESEA BUDGET REQUESTS VS. APPROPRIATIONS

Fiscal year	President's budget request (in thousands)	% Increase over previous year's appropriation	Appropriation (in thousands)	% Increase over previous year's appropriation
1994 .....	\$9,124,842	4.58	\$8,776,528	0.59
1995 .....	10,478,889	19.40	9,663,290	10.10
1996 .....	10,258,296	6.44	9,495,162	-1.74
1997 .....	10,439,200	9.94	10,620,080	11.85
1998 .....	11,351,574	6.89	11,523,351	8.51
1999 .....	13,333,192	15.71	13,851,297	20.20
2000 .....	14,510,420	4.76	14,811,252	6.93
2001 .....	18,114,500	22.30	18,411,464	24.31
Average Increase .....	1,058,716	8.67	1,099,980	9.06
Bush Budget FY 2002 .....	669,000	3.60		

Mr. KENNEDY. On the education budget, I want to emphasize something that is enormously important and to which the American people must pay attention: this budget conference agreement, which arrived at 2 a.m. this morning, includes an outline of what will be invested in education over the next 10 years. This is the budget that has the support of some Republicans in Congress and the administration.

If we look at education and what the funding will be over the next 10 years, I hope our Members will look at the part of the budget—the reference is H1867, in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from the House. Look at the figures there.

Fiscal year 2001, budget authority of \$76.9 billion, outlays of \$69.850 billion;

then for 2002, \$81.234 billion in budget authority, \$76.742 billion in outlays: that is about a 5-percent real increase after adjusting for inflation. The Department of Education's FY 2002 Budget Summary confirms, on page 2: "The President is requesting \$44.5 billion in discretionary appropriations for the Department of Education in fiscal year 2002, . . . an increase of \$2.5 billion or 5.9 percent over the 2001 program level."

Fiscal year 2003, the outlays go from \$76 billion to \$81 billion. Fiscal years 2004 to 2005, it goes from \$81 billion to \$83 billion; 2005, it goes from \$83 billion to \$85 billion; 2006, \$87 billion; 2007, \$89 billion; 2008, \$92 billion; 2009, \$94 billion; 2010, \$96 billion; 2011, \$99 billion. Flat funding for education for the next 10 years after accounting for inflation. This is the guidepost for educational funding for the next 10 years. Flat funding. No increase.

With respect to the priorities for this country, how do we reach the recognition that education is the No. 1 priority for this country when the administration and the Republican leadership in the House and the Senate have said no increase; none whatsoever. Flat funding in the area of education, not for next year or the year after, but flat funding over every one of the remaining 8 years of this decade, that is the guidepost in this budget proposal.

That is absolutely unacceptable, Mr. President. Unacceptable. How are we going to explain it? When are we going to hear the explanation from the budgeteers? What happened to the Senate vote on the Harkin amendment where, in a bipartisan way, the Senate voted to increase education investments by \$250 billion over the next ten years. We wanted funding for Title I. We wanted funding for the Head Start Program. We wanted funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program. We still want to fund an investment in children. Why? Because they are our future. We know if we do not invest in our children, they are not going to be able to fully participate in our society, in our economy, and be productive and creative members of society. That is what this debate is all about.

There is no issue that comes before us that more defines what we are about as a society than whether we are going to have a strong educational system.

What is Republicans' real message? On the one hand, we hear education is the No. 1 priority. Yet here's the budget, Mr. President, funding over the next 10 years. This is absolutely shocking. It certainly does not reflect the opinion of the Senate when yesterday the Senate responded to the superb amendment that was offered by Senator HAGEL, a Republican, Senator HARKIN, a Democrat, dealing with special needs of children and recognizing we made a commitment to the States that we were going to provide 40 percent of funding for special education. We are at about 15, 17 percent of the

funding now. Yesterday, this body went on record saying, yes, we want to keep our promise to those children, families, and local communities.

In the evening yesterday, again in a bipartisan effort with Senator DODD and Senator COLLINS, the Senate voted overwhelmingly to provide full funding for the Title I program over the next 10 years. It provided a virtual doubling of the number of children who would be reached in the first year under Title I. It was adopted overwhelmingly last evening, Mr. President.

Nonetheless, we have in this budget flat funding for the next 10 years. Unacceptable, I say.

If we look further in the budget on pages H1868-69 of yesterday's House CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Republican budget says that \$336.2 billion in non-defense discretionary spending will be available next year. But the Congressional Budget Office tells us that the amount of funding necessary to provide current services over the next year, including education, health, NIH, and assistance for Seniors under the Older Americans Act, is \$343 billion. Just look here in chapter 4, of the Congressional Budget Office's Spending Outlook, Table 4-4: \$343 billion will be necessary for all government non-defense discretionary spending in 2002. But look at what the budget says, it limits this to \$336 billion. This means the budget provides \$7 billion less, which will mean there will be cuts in education, health, the environment, or other essential government services.

These are the facts. We can talk about our priorities. We can talk about what the administration is thinking about, but this budget shows Republicans' true economic objectives. They focus on tax cuts for the super wealthy, period. This budget document says we will have in excess of a \$1.2 trillion tax cuts going to some of the wealthiest individuals in our country and we will have flat funding in education.

I cannot understand how Members of this body can support this budget and say we give education a priority. This is so discouraging.

We have before us good education reform legislation as a result of a bipartisan effort to ensure we are going to combine robust resources and accountability to get constructive and productive results from schools.

While we work to make our education policy the best, under this budget, we effectively turn our backs on the needs of students across this country. It's a disgrace.

I take issue with comments made earlier about what has been happening in Title I. I heard we really don't need to fund Title I because it will take so long for the programs we are passing to be put into effect: It will take time to develop the tests; it will take time for the schools to allegedly fail over a period of time; it will take time before we need the resources. I question that. That is not my reading of the specific language.

This bill talks about school improvement for failing schools. We know today we have 10,000 failing schools. This particular legislation has approaches to help local communities and assist them to get out of the category of failing schools. That will take resources. We don't have to wait 2, 3, 4, 5 years. We don't have to do that. We know there are 10,000 failing schools in the country today. We know the average cost is \$180,000 to turn around a failing school. There are some 57 research-based, comprehensive school reform models that have been identified by the New American Schools Corporation as proven and successful. School committees choose their preferred model. The decision is made locally.

For a \$1.8 billion commitment, we could begin turning around every failing school tomorrow. We have not gotten that. That is what we want to try to do. People say, wait for the bill to go into effect. It will have to be in effect 3 or 4 or 5 years before we force action to turn around failing schools. But there are 10,000 failing schools that can be turned around now. The parents want them improved now. Why wait?

In the BEST bill, we seek to turn around those 10,000 needy schools now. Under the budget the administration suggested, we will be able to reach only 2,440 schools. This is a missed opportunity. It makes no sense. Do we want a \$1.2 trillion tax cut or do we want to take a small percent of that, less than half of 1 percent that would fund these programs? We ought to have the vote on that. Should we have less than a one-half of 1 percent reduction in the tax program to try to turn around the schools, or shall we go ahead and give the tax cut?

The Budget Committees, that are the voice of the Republican majority, say we will shortchange the schools. We are resisting that. The Senate is resisting that in a bipartisan way. Those votes last night were bipartisan. That is a clear reflection of where we are. We are very hopeful of using those votes to try to persuade the Administration to make the kinds of investments in the children needed.

With all respect to those who spoke earlier today, I would like to review what has happened historically in terms of the NAEP test. The federal government contributes 6 or 7 cents out of every education dollar spent. Education is primarily the State and local responsibility. On the federal level, we try to target aid toward the neediest children. Fifteen percent of the children in this country are poor. You have to be desperately poor to qualify under Title I. There are some 10.3 million children we identify as needy for the purposes of Title I. But we provide enough funding to reach only 3.5 million of those children. We think we ought to fully fund Title I and really leave no child behind.

In recent years, we have seen NAEP achievement gains by needy children. They have been gradually going up

with regard to white children, gradually going up with regard to Hispanics, gradually going up with regard to blacks. What is most encouraging, you can say look how little progress has been made, or you can say progress has been made. We are talking about the poorest of the poor, the neediest of the needy.

The fact we added 5 million disabled children, mainstreamed them, with physical and mental challenges, the fact we have had an explosion of homelessness, the fact we have had an explosion in the number of migrant children impacted, and we have had a dramatic increase in the immigrant children attending schools—all those have impacted achievement levels. We have had a very significant increase in those speaking different languages, foreign languages, and difficulties associated with that.

In spite of these new challenges, the achievement gap between children of different races and classes has been reduced. We see in 13-year-olds, in math, a 46-percent achievement gap reduced to a 32 percent gap, a 30-percent change. We are moving in the right direction.

The reduced achievement gap has come without the further improvements brought in this legislation—improvements that will strengthen the quality of education for the teachers, improve the curriculum, give the schools more authority, fund supplementary services in the afterschool programs, and come from an insistence on results.

We have seen even under the old system that we have been making some progress—not as much as any of us would like, but we have seen the lines moving in the right direction, which has to be a part of our national purpose and goal. In this case, it was for 13-year-olds in the area of math.

In reading, for 9-year-olds, there was a 44 percent gap in the 1970s, and a 29-percent gap in 1996. The best results show minority students are moving in the right direction—there has been a 34-percent change in the last 30 years. It is not a dramatic change, but when you look at the expansion of the student body and the significant expansion of students, poor children getting poorer, and all the other factors that impact children, it is still moving along—not as fast as any Members would like, but we are making some progress under the NAEP tests.

This chart shows for 17-year-olds, in reading, a 52-percent gap at the start of the program, down to a 29-percent gap at the present time; fairly flat at the top, and moving up with regard to minority students.

For the 9-year-old kids, in science, a 57-percent gap has been reduced to a 41-percent gap, a 28-percent change. Look at the gap in minority students. They have moved up in an important way.

We have made some progress. We spend \$400 billion a year on K-12. The main federal program is only \$8 billion,



about 2 cents out of each dollar spent, and we are still making progress.

Yesterday, I used the example of the special situations where we had many of the programs we have supported and illustrated in this legislation that have resulted in dramatic improvements for children.

I will just mention a few.

Goethe Middle School, Sacramento, CA—With chronically low test scores across the curriculum, Goethe Middle School recently decided to attack its academic problems at their root: Many students had never learned to read well. Beginning with the 1997-98 school year, Goethe took a radical step. It trained all instructional staff in Corrective Reading and used fourth period for a mandatory reading class for virtually every student. Although this DI implementation is still too new to judge, preliminary data are encouraging. In the fall of 1997, only 11 percent of Goethe students could read above a sixth-grade level, while 12 percent were at a "high average" level for sixth grade. In other words, fewer than one in four students had much hope of keeping up with the reading assignments usually required of middle school students. By the end of the school year, the number of students reading at least at this basic level had more than doubled: 22 percent were at the "high average" level, 26 percent were above.

This legislation will expand that type of program.

Kalispell, MT—The only independent study of Early Steps was conducted in Kalispell, Montana, a small school district with many lower- and middle-class Caucasian families attending Title I schools. In general, the student selected into the study were among the most economically disadvantaged in the district. All students in the study were also performing in the lowest 20th percentile of their class in reading and on related tasks, such as alphabetic knowledge, spelling, word attack and recognition of words in context. Students were assigned to two matched groups, receiving different types of tutorial interventions. After one year, students who had been taught using Early Steps significantly outperformed their peers in reading assessments. In addition, 52 percent of the Early Steps students were found to be reading at or above grade level, compared to 23 percent of students in the control group.

We know that this program can work.

Cameron Elementary School, Fairfax County, VA—In Fairfax County, Cameron Elementary School's reading scores were below average, and well below those of many schools in the district. With as many as 40 percent of students suffering from low reading achievement, the school decided to implement ECRI as a summer school intervention. By the end of the summer, not only had students in the 4th and 6th grades increased their scores by 10 points, but they also ranked at or above the national average on standardized tests.

We have adopted the kinds of programs there which have been successful.

Arkansas—The state of Arkansas approved Reading Recovery for statewide use in 1988. From 1991 to 1994, 1,088 struggling students received the full RR program (defined as having received 60 lessons). Of those students, 940 (86 percent) attained grade level. Fifty-nine students who had successfully completed the program were followed for an additional two years. Compared to a random sample of non-RR students, the RR students

tended to perform as well or better on measures of dictation, spelling and text reading in both the third and fourth grades.

Mr. President, we have many examples of improving academic achievement and the reading ability of the nation's schoolchildren. We can help children achieve. That is what this legislation is all about. We have the ability to do it. The real question is whether we aim to reach all of these children, or whether we aim to reach only one-third of them? That is the issue.

Earlier we heard a good deal about the improvements that were taking place in Houston, Texas. Secretary Paige is from Houston. All of the Houston's educational improvements that were highlighted earlier in this debate have come at a cost Houston has seen a 43 percent increase in education spending between 1995 and 2000. That is an investment in children. That is what we are asking for. We have seen it work in Houston.

In Dallas, too, we have seen results. Dallas has made academic gains. Since Dallas made an investment in their accountability system, between 1994 and 2000, they have seen a 21% increase in the number of students that are passing all portions of the TAAS. Before the Texas accountability system, Texas was spending \$673 million in Dallas. Today, they spend \$985 million. That is a 46 percent increase—\$312 million.

These examples indicate real investments. Real money. We have the programs and the educational reforms. We know that when the reforms are in place, and when we have significant investments, we get results. We have a bill that contains the right programs, but now we need the resources.

AMENDMENT NO. 375 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk. I ask the pending amendment be temporarily set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] proposes an amendment numbered 375 to amendment No. 358.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding, and authorize appropriations for, title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965)

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. 902. SENSE OF THE SENATE; AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should appropriate \$3,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 to carry out part A title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and thereby—

(1) provide that schools, local educational agencies, and States have the resources they

need to put a highly qualified teacher in every classroom in each school in which 50 percent or more of the children are from low income families, over the next 4 years;

(2) provide 125,000 new teachers with mentors and year-long supervised internships; and

(3) provide high quality pedagogical training for every teacher in every school.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out title II part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—

(1) \$3,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

(2) \$4,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

(3) \$4,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;

(4) \$5,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2006;

(5) \$5,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2007;

(6) \$6,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this legislation is focused on ensuring that there is a well-trained teacher in every classroom for all of the children. This amendment is also about providing teachers with opportunities for mentorship and other support services to create successful pathways toward academic achievement and accomplishment.

The BEST Act currently authorizes \$3 billion professional development in the first fiscal year covered by the bill. The current authorization includes \$1.6 billion previously authorized for class-size reduction, and about \$500 million for the Eisenhower math-science professional development program.

What we are saying in this amendment is that we should give teacher training a special priority in future years as well. The amendment provides for a modest increase of \$500 million more in authorized funding levels in each of the following years, for the next 6 years. This is a 7-year authorization bill. Title II, Part A will be used to support qualifying teachers, attract new teachers, and provide mentors for new teachers. That is what this amendment is about. At the end of the 7 years, we will have well-qualified teachers in virtually every high poverty classroom. Under current law, we would reach less than half that many in 7 years.

Having a qualified teacher in every classroom is the key to educational success. My friend from New Hampshire, Senator GREGG, mentioned four or five factors this morning that really strengthen education. Well-qualified teachers was one of those factors. Many believe it is most important. It is difficult to make a judgment about the most important factor influencing achievement, but quality teaching certainly, without question, is one of the most important.

Under current law, there is high-quality professional development for less than 5 percent of the Nation's teachers, approximately, 100,000 out of the current 2.8 million. There are more than 750,000 teachers in the high-poverty schools who do not have undergraduate degrees in their primary instruction.

This amendment provides an increased authorization for professional development for every teacher in high-

poverty schools. It would positively impact virtually 50 percent of all teachers. In the first year alone, it would provide subject matter training to about 187,000 teachers in high poverty schools who do not have an undergraduate degree in their primary instructional field.

With the additional funding in the second year, we will get another quarter of the 750,000. We will not only do that, but we will also make sure that we provide mentoring support for 125,000 new teachers.

That is what we need—quality training for current teachers, mentors for new teachers, and continued and ongoing professional development. That is the way you ensure the atmosphere and the climate for learning. That is what we find in almost every study that has been done.

I hope those who are interested in this subject matter take a few moments to review this excellent report, "What Matters Most, Teaching for America's Future." It was published in 1996. It is the document recognized as the leading authority in terms of what is necessary in the classroom to help a child learn.

I will take a few moments to mention a few of the observations. This is on page 41.

Most U.S. teachers have almost no time to consult together or learn about new teaching strategies, unlike their peers in many European and Asian countries where teachers have substantial time to plan and study with one another. In Germany, Japan, and China, for example, teachers spend between 15 and 20 hours per week working with colleagues on developing curriculum, counseling students, and pursuing their own learning. They regularly visit and serve other school classrooms and attend seminars provided by university faculty and other teachers, conduct group research projects, and participate in teacher-led study groups. The result is a rich environment for continuous learning about teaching and the needs of students.

Instead of these ongoing learning opportunities, American teachers get a few brief workshops offering packaged programs from outside consultants and that contribute little to deepening their subject knowledge or teaching skills.

I couldn't say it better than that. We are trying to change that.

What about the importance of mentoring? The weight of accumulated evidence clearly shows that traditional sink-or-swim induction to teaching contributes to high attrition and lower levels of teacher effectiveness.

Sink or swim, put a new teacher with no seniority in the toughest class in America, and they don't last. Forty percent leave in the first 2 years. You put that teacher in the class with an experienced teacher and mentor a young teacher, and you find that you reduce the number of teachers that leave the profession by about 80 percent.

Supervised internships or residencies regularly provided for new entrants in other professions, such as architects, psychologists, nurses, doctors, and engineers, are rare in teaching, but they have proven to be quite effective where they exist. Some States have created programs for new teacher induction. Few have maintained the commitment required. With few exceptions, initiatives during the 1980s focused on evaluation and failed to fund mentoring programs. Again, the problem is not that we do not know how to support beginning teachers. The problem is that we have not yet developed the commitment to do so routinely.

We know what is necessary and what is needed. Again, work in the classroom, getting the well-trained teachers, getting the mentoring and doing it in a continuous way is absolutely key.

I again point out from this study, in addition, that investing in targeted recruitment preparation for teachers for high-need locations is a national need. That is why we believe we have a responsibility to move ahead in this area.

I will not take additional time in terms of the justification. It is all here in a very compelling way.

I say one additional thing about this at this time. We want to make sure in the legislation, in title II part A, that we set a strong definition for all qualified teachers who have an academic major in the arts and sciences, develop competence in a high-level of in-core academic subjects, and are certified and licensed by the States.

My amendment ensures that professional development and mentoring activities are research-based and of high quality. It requires professional development activities be an integral part of broad, school-wide improvement plans, are sustained, and of such high quality and sufficient duration to have a positive and lasting impact on classroom instruction.

My amendment does not promote the one-time workshops we have now but what the best available research tells us.

My amendment promotes mentoring activities that are multi-year and designed to help teachers continue to improve their practice of teaching and develop their instructional skills.

It ensures that professional development activities are aligned with State content standards, student performance standards, assessment, and the curriculum of programs tied to those standards.

We are trying to get well-qualified teachers in the classroom. We are promoting a high-grade curriculum, tests that are not going to be a quick, slick, or easy multiple-choice test, but a test that is really going to test the ability of the child to think through complex problems in math, science, literature, and be able to express them by writing in these areas.

We need all of these reforms. We need thoughtful tests that challenge children. We need strengthened curricula, and we need quality teaching.

We require in this legislation that all teachers in schools with 50 percent of poverty or higher are highly qualified in 4 years. I don't believe, quite frankly, under the bill that we can achieve that with the resources provided.

I think the additional funding that we provide in this amendment will move us on a pathway to being able to achieve that. Then we move ahead to the other parts.

Finally, I hope the Senate will not accept the Craig amendment that is before us. It would effectively undermine in a very significant and important way what we are really attempting to do. The Craig amendment is the wrong approach to improving education. The Craig amendment tells already failing schools that they have to improve achievement before receiving the additional resources. That is a recipe for failure.

The schools and children failing need additional resources in order to achieve the heightened standards we are demanding of them in this legislation.

Mr. President, we have a strong blueprint. We know that once this legislation is achieved it will trigger school improvement. And we have the ability to do so. For my money, we have a greater demand than there are the resources. But we have the ability to do so.

If we are not going to be able to show results by the range of different support that is available under this legislation, we will have a prescription for disaster in terms of addressing the real needs of children. It is counterintuitive to say to children that we are not going to give you what you know you need until you make progress.

So we will have a chance, I imagine, when the Senator from Idaho is present to get into greater debate. But it does seem to me that his amendment runs in conflict with the central thrust of this legislation. I hope the amendment is not adopted.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment by Senator KENNEDY.

In S. 1, we have combined the class size reduction program with the Eisenhower math and science program to create a single, substantial funding stream for staff development. Given the difficulty in finding teachers who have adequate pre-service training in reading, math, science, and special education, in-service professional development is critically important.

This amendment establishes a set of ambitious goals for the funding of title II of S. 1, much like the amendment of Senators DODD and COLLINS on title I.

If we are going to meet the goals established in this legislation—that every child reach proficiency—then we must upgrade the teaching force. This amendment sends the right signal.

I am pleased to join the Senator in this amendment. I shall work with him to get it adopted.



Seeing no other Senator asking for recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, we are debating the education reform act. Debate over this bill is increasingly boiling down to debate over one question: What is Congress' solution to the problems in our schools, specifically, lagging overall achievement and the fact that too many children are failed altogether?

Anyone watching this debate will realize there is a divide between those of us who believe that the solution lies in reform and those, on the other hand, who believe that the solution is to spend more of your money.

This morning, the Senator from New Hampshire was very clear in pointing out how the expenditure of billions and billions of dollars over the years has not resulted in any improvement in the test scores of our children, and, indeed, after the expenditure of over \$120 billion for the last 30 years, our children are actually falling further behind than ever before.

Granted, those of us who advocate that reform have committed to significant funding increases. Again, as the Senator from New Hampshire noted earlier today, the budgets offered by President Bush and supported by the Republicans in the Senate have called for substantially increased spending on the education program. Of course, granted, most who focus on spending pay lipservice to the need for reform but just not too much of it. I think that is the fundamental divide in this debate.

I am concerned that as we proceed with amendments the spending side is making up a great deal of ground, while the reformers who are looking to change the system in order to help our kids are losing by contrast. Our achievements are looking very meager in contrast.

As politicians, we will likely benefit, at least in the short term, from producing a bill that gives the special interests a taxpayer-funded windfall, in exchange for a bare minimum of reform. But our political exercise will not serve America's children; 6 or 7 years from now, we will be making the same excuses to the taxpayers who were promised improvement.

We should stop making excuses for failure and begin by retiring the most tired excuse of all, which is that a lack of resources explains why our public education system is failing so many of our children—a lack of resources, of course, in the form of taxpayer dollars for education programs.

The education special interests may come up short in educating the chil-

dren who most desperately need the help, but they are experts at excuses. Here are some in the education sector who have moved beyond excuses. This is a book called "No Excuses," by Samuel Casey Carter. It has lessons from 21 high-performing, high-poverty schools. It shows how these schools have implemented commonsense reforms and overcome the challenges that others use as excuses for failure.

The successes of these schools were not achieved by the expenditure of large quantities of new funding but by the innovations of caring people. Most of the programs are in very poor areas, minority areas, and the schools that have some of the best achievements are either charter public schools or private schools. They have overcome modest budgets, typically budgets more modest than many public schools have. They have overcome the psychological and material impediments to learning, which many young people suffer from today. In short, they have overcome big excuse No. 1, the "more money excuse," and big excuse No. 2, also known and characterized by President Bush as the "bigotry of low expectations," which attempts to excuse failure by saying disadvantaged children can't learn and excel.

The book is full of stories. For example, Patsy Burk's story of Owen Elementary School in Detroit, MI, in which 82 percent of the students at the school come from low-income families. Yet, the reading and math scores have improved dramatically as a result of people who care, the innovations in that particular school, and a very innovative team approach to teaching in that school.

Then there is Michael Feinburg School and the Kip Academy in Houston, TX. "There are no shortcuts" is the simple motto of the Kip Academy. They have 9½ hour days, classes on Saturday, school during the summer, and a lot of homework. These are all nonnegotiable at this school. They are 95 percent low-income. Yet, the math and reading scores are very, very good.

Example after example is identified in this particular book. It shows how these schools have implemented commonsense reform and overcome the usual excuses for failure. I think there are practices that parents would like to see employed in their own schools, in the schools that they would like to have their children attend, that are similar to those innovative practices identified in this particular book. But most of these parents don't have the same opportunity as the parents of the kids identified in this book. These kids had a choice; their parents had a choice on where they were going to send their kids. It was that very choice that enabled them to provide the kind of education they knew was best for their particular kids.

When you don't have that choice and you are stuck in a failing school, there is a great deal of frustration. We have seen that not only in the debate today

but also throughout the country in the last several years. That is what President Bush has tried to get away from—the idea that you are stuck in a failing school system.

As the lessons in this particular book show, when you have a choice where you can send your children, not only are you able to take them to the school that best fits their needs and where they can excel but the competition that is provided by those schools to the failing schools tends to bring the failing schools up as well because as kids leave those schools, obviously people begin asking questions. Sometimes the State dollars leave the school as well. So those schools have an incentive to improve.

I can remember in my own State of Arizona opening the paper one day and seeing a full-page ad from a public school—frankly, a public school that was pretty good—advertising for students to come back to this particular public school. I inquired into it. What I found was that in this very fast-growing area of one of the Phoenix suburbs, a lot of the kids were joining up with the private schools that were available or the charter schools that had opened up in the area. Therefore, the enrollment in the large public school was essentially flat.

The superintendent, rather than complaining about it or making excuses, had gone to these charter schools and private schools and asked why so many kids were leaving his public school district and the larger schools and attending these others. He found that they were innovating, providing things that the parents of the students really wanted. So he chose from among those innovations those that he thought could best be incorporated into the large public schools of which he was superintendent.

When those reforms were instituted, he then advertised them to the parents of the kids in the school district. He said: We have changed. We have instituted some reforms now. We think you are going to like these things. Come back to the public schools.

It has been one of the best examples of a public school system which was not doing too badly but could improve. The competition caused it to reexamine what it needed to improve, and it did so. The enrollment since then has gone up. The students are doing very well on scores, and I think but for the competition, that school would not be able to brag about that today.

We need to ask the parents of children in failing schools: Would you rather the Federal Government appropriate funds to fully fund your failing school or would you rather be given the freedom to enroll your child in one of these no excuses schools? The kind about which I am talking. I think we all know the answer.

I am afraid the new 900-page negotiated bill that is going to replace the old 800-page bill passed by the committee, while it provides for some modest enhancement of school choice, does

so only under very rigid conditions with significant limitations, and that concerns me greatly.

There will be amendments to broaden that choice, to extend the benefits of education freedom to more of America's families and children. I look forward to the debate on those amendments, and I certainly look forward to supporting them.

I believe that giving parents that freedom is the most certain path to improvement in education because parents, unlike politicians, are not going to accept excuses for failure.

I look forward to the amendments when they are offered. I look forward to offering an amendment on my own which will show through a tax credit for contributions to special scholarship funds which can provide scholarships for children in low-income areas to attend the school of their choice, we can enhance this kind of competition and enhance freedom as a result. I look forward to the debate, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his contribution to the debate and his interest in education.

AMENDMENT NO. 373

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order with respect to amendment No. 373.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I understand there is no objection to this amendment, and I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 373.

The amendment (No. 373) was agreed to.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to take a minute or so as we complete the first few days of debate on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. There are, I am sure, countless amendments still pending that we will consider in the following week or two, before we complete full consideration of a bill we only deal with—and this may come as a surprise to many Americans—once every 5 or 6 years. Unlike agriculture, defense, or a variety of other subject matters dealt with annually, we only debate elementary and secondary education and higher education every 5 or 6 years.

It seems to me we ought to have an annual discussion of the condition of America's public schools, how well they are doing, and what more we could be doing to assist local communities and States in providing the best possible education for every child.

Over the last few days, we have begun to consider amendments. Senator COLLINS of Maine offered an amendment dealing with reading which was adopted unanimously. Senator JEFFORDS had a trigger on testing which was adopted almost unani-

mously. Senator HARKIN and Senator HAGEL offered an amendment that dealt with full funding of special education, which is something that every mayor, every superintendent of schools, every board of education in my State of Connecticut—and, I am confident, in other States—have been asking us to do for years.

Children with disabilities ought to have the same opportunity to reach their maximum potential, as every child. I think all Americans today accept that notion.

Over the years, many have advocated for us to reach the goal of a quarter of a century ago of funding 40 percent of States' special education costs. Today, we're at about 15 percent.

In the measures similar to the amendment offered by Senator HARKIN and Senator HAGEL or have been offered over the years by Senator JEFFORDS, myself, and many others—on occasion, they actually passed the Senate but did not pass the other body or were dropped in conference—something always happened to frustrate the overwhelming desire of people in this country for the U.S. Government to meet its goal. The amendment adopted here will now require that.

I am confident the bill, for reasons I will state in a minute, will become law in this country, and for the first time we will have language which takes us to that goal.

And, along with my friend and colleague from Maine, Senator COLLINS, I was the author of an amendment that will fully fund title I, the heart of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. That is what this bill is all about since, again, about 35 years ago we decided our role in public education would be to help the most disadvantaged communities and kids of the country. From the beginning in the early 1960s, that is what the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was designed to do. There are other pieces of it, but about 50 percent of the dollars go to title I. Yet, we only fund title I at one-third of the goal we established.

Yesterday, this body went on record with the overwhelming vote of 79-21 in support of full funding of title I over the next 10 years, with the bulk of that obligation being met over the next 4 or 5 years, 75 to 80 percent of the full funding requirement. This now is going to make it possible, in my view, to have a chance to meet the concerns that have been raised by many over the quality of public education.

The bill will also include some long-sought-after reforms on accountability and standards so the children are not just warehoused and pushed from grade to grade without ever having met the educational requirements. That has gone on. We all know about it. Everyone knows about it at local and State levels.

This bill says that we really want some accountability, we want some standards, we want some means by

which we measure whether or not children are, in fact, learning.

Many of us accept that is something we ought to do in the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act. But we also say if you are going to do that, you have to put the resources in place so these reforms have a chance of producing the desired results. Reform without resources is just a lot of hot air. And resources without reforms is a waste of money.

Now we are, I hope, in this bill—having adopted the full funding of title I and the anticipated adoption of reforms—going to build on the work we did in 1994 to marry reforms and resources. So many of us conclude this first week of debate with a sense of optimism that, frankly, I did not have 24 hours ago. I had a deep concern we were going to adopt mandates for our local communities and tell our communities what they had to do and then not participate in providing the resources to achieve those goals.

I still have some outstanding concerns that will not be addressed in this bill, but I raise them briefly today. I may try to find some way to give expression to these ideas in the coming week in this debate.

I think it is outrageous that the Federal Government is such a minor player, financially, in the cost of educating America's kids. I always say this. I think Americans would be stunned to discover that, of their Federal taxes that come to Washington, less than 1 percent go back to the education of elementary and secondary school students around the country. In elementary and secondary education, the earliest building block, in many ways, of a child's learning, your National Government is really only a minor participant.

We are very good at instructing our towns and cities how to educate children, and telling the States, but when it comes to putting our money where our mouth is, as the old expression goes, we are pretty cheap.

That goes back a long time. "Education was only the responsibility of local communities. The National Government just ought to stay as far away from elementary and secondary education as possible." That was the idea in the 19th century. That was the idea through much of the 20th century.

We ought to be rethinking the structure of funding education in this country as we enter the 21st century. No longer will the children in my State merely be competing with the children of New Jersey or California or Texas or New York. The child growing up in Connecticut will be competing with children in Beijing, Moscow, South Africa, Australia, Paris, London. That is the world they will be entering. The idea that we would accept a 19th and 20th century structure to educate children to compete in a 21st century global economy is outrageous, in my view, and foolish.

You cannot expect sufficient resources to help these children to come

exclusively or almost exclusively, as they do in at least in 40 States, to come from a local property tax. You are going to bankrupt these homeowners. And, in the poorest communities where the need is greatest for creating opportunity, the resources are the most scarce. I would like to see us say at some point to our communities and States: You bear one-third apiece and we will pick up a third of the cost.

First of all, just think of the property tax relief for millions of Americans. They are sending their money to Washington. We are taking their Federal taxes. As I said, less than one-half of 1 percent is going to secondary and elementary education. Why not see if we can become a better partner?

As we lecture States and localities about what they are not doing, it might be helpful if we also increased what we are doing to contribute to their attracting qualified teachers, seeing that schools are modern and wired with the technology kids will need to be economically independent, contributing members of what we want to be the greatest country on Earth in the 21st century as it was in the 20th century.

I very much would like to see us do that. We will not do that in this bill, but I invite some discussion of how, in the coming years, we can be a better partner in education.

The great irony is that we spend the bulk of our tax dollars in the area of 18 to 22 through Pell grants and Stafford loans, assistance for higher education. And, without question, those programs are invaluable.

But we know that the most important years of a human being's development in terms of their ability to learn and to have the tools necessary to succeed in life, occur in the earlier years of life. We ought to do more in the earliest stage. If we do, more children will succeed as they go on toward adulthood.

The second point I wanted to make is this: I want to see some accountability out of the States, too. We are telling towns and localities they have to do a better job. If not, we are going to shut down their schools.

I don't agree with the idea that the solution that we are going to solve the problem of schools in poor-inner city or poor rural areas by paying for the students to attend private schools. In desperately poor areas there are not those kinds of alternatives except in the most rare of circumstances.

We are talking about being pretty tough with local schools in this bill. I'm all for accountability, but I would like to raise the possibility of getting a little tough with the States, as well. This may be an anathema for some.

There is great disparity based on the affluence and poverty of our respective communities within these States. This has provoked a great debate about the States. I am not suggesting a one-size-fits-all solution, but it seems to me, we might want to include the States in

this discussion so that you will at least begin to minimize the disparity in opportunity.

My State is a good example. I don't blame present administrations or recent administrations. Administrations have wrestled with this idea for a long time. I am sure this is the case in your State, Mr. President, in New Jersey. It is pretty much the case in all of our States.

I represent the most affluent State in America. Here we are, a State with incredibly affluent communities. They do a magnificent job in allocating their resources to improving the quality of public education in their communities. Yet I can take you from one of those communities—I am not exaggerating—for a car ride in less than 15 minutes to a neighboring community that ranks in the top 10 of the poorest communities in America. One community will have a public high school that can compete with a community college in terms of its facilities, athletics, radio, television stations, language laboratories, and wonderful teachers who receive more than decent compensation to teach children in that community. And 15 minutes away, I can take you to a place where the buildings are falling apart, technology is rarely available, and police officers are on every floor. You begin to wonder if you are in a school or a detention facility.

There are wonderful teachers and wonderful students in these schools who struggle every day to provide and receive the best educational opportunity they can. But in the most affluent State in the country, in the most affluent Nation on the face of this Earth, we have communities within minutes of each other where the educational opportunity—that is all I am talking about—is light-years apart.

We can't accept this anymore. Especially as we enter the 21st century with the economic gap growing wider every day, when we will end up having those who are well prepared to fit in this information technology age and the global economy, and those who will have a hard time finding the most menial jobs in America because we didn't provide a decent education.

I say to our partners in all of this, our States, just as we say to our communities, that we want you to do a better job as well. I am going to explore some legislative language on how we might demand greater accountability for seeing that equal opportunity for education is going to be met at the State as well as the local and national levels.

I don't expect anything dramatic to be adopted in this Chamber on this particular bill. But it is a debate we ought to start. CHAKA FATTAH, a very effective Member of Congress from the city of Philadelphia, is a good friend of mine. CHAKA FATTAH wrote language which specifically addresses this issue. In fact, he offered it in the U.S. House of Representatives in the previous Congress and received close to 200 votes in

the other Chamber. It is a rather complicated proposal but one which goes to the heart of this issue, again without insisting on any particular formulation but saying the States have to do a better job in working to see to it that equal opportunity in education is going to be available to all students and be held to some degree of accountability on this issue.

I commend Congressman FATTAH for offering that amendment and for provoking that debate. He sent me the language on that. I am going to submit it for the consideration of my colleagues, perhaps with some variation, over the next couple of weeks.

Again, I thank the membership for their hard work, and especially of Senator KENNEDY and Senator JEFFORDS, the ranking member and chair of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee on which I have the pleasure of sitting. I know my colleague from New Jersey has a strong desire to join at some point. We hope he will be there with us. It is an exciting committee. They have done a good job.

I commend Senator DASCHLE, the Democratic leader, and Senator LOTT as well, for moving this debate along.

This has been a pretty good first week—better than I ever thought it would when we started the week. We see a lot more has to be considered. I will have amendments to offer with Senator SHELBY of Alabama and Senator DOMENICI of New Mexico. We will be proposing those amendments at the appropriate time, which we hope our colleagues will support.

I look forward to those debates and discussions, and other amendments our colleagues will be offering.

I think we have started out on a pretty good foot. We have not answered all of the questions. But I think we are going to marry resources and reforms in a package that most of us are going to be able to support.

AMENDMENT NO. 375 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, I send a modification to the desk of an amendment he has offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 375) to amendment No. 358, as modified, is as follows: (Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding, and authorize appropriations for, title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965)

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. 902. SENSE OF THE SENATE; AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should appropriate \$3,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 to carry out part A title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and thereby—

(1) provide that schools, local educational agencies, and States have the resources they

need to put a highly qualified teacher in every classroom in each school in which 50 percent or more of the children are from low income families, over the next 4 years;

(2) provide 125,000 new teachers with mentors and year-long supervised internships; and

(3) provide high quality pedagogical training for every teacher in every school.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out title II Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—

(1) \$3,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

(2) \$4,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

(3) \$4,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;

(4) \$5,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2006;

(5) \$5,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2007;

(6) \$6,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.

### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, is morning business the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, with a 10-minute limitation.

Mr. DODD. I gather our colleague and friend from West Virginia may be here shortly, as he is inclined to do on Fridays for periods of enlightenment. I encourage Members to listen carefully to the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia. He always has the most interesting discussions on history and poetry and important national holidays and days of recognition. It is worthy of the Senate's attention for those who may be following the debate through the channels of public communication.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for as long as is necessary, and it will not be all that long, but long enough.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### THE FUTURE COURSE OF THE INTERNATIONAL CLIMATE CHANGE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, earlier this week, Vice President CHENEY gave us a brief glimpse of the administration's soon-to-be-released energy plan that suggests that we need to take action to avert an impending energy crisis. He suggested that the plan will push for increasing fuel supplies from domestic sources. Still, the Vice President did

not explain how domestic climate change programs will be reflected in the energy plan, nor did he discuss press reports that the administration is developing a plan to deal with the international aspects of climate change.

I would like to focus on the latter, and discuss recent decisions by the administration regarding the international negotiations. Climate change cannot be discussed in complete isolation from the soon-to-be released energy plan, since the issue of climate change must be addressed both domestically and internationally.

I wish to note, at the outset, that I applaud the administration's support for clean coal technologies and the administration's recognition that coal is one of our country's most important sources of energy. I recognize and strongly support this policy by the executive branch. A bill I have introduced this session, S. 60, the National Electricity and Environmental Technology Act, addresses the challenges faced by coal, and I would welcome the administration's active support to utilize coal in a cleaner, more efficient way.

I also believe, however, that it would be a mistake to focus too heavily just on increasing fuel supplies from domestic sources. If that is where the administration is headed, it is not on exactly the right path. In order to solve the challenge of climate change, we must develop new domestic sources such as coal, using clean coal technologies, while also engaging in bold initiatives to develop new technologies in the area of energy conservation, energy efficiency, and renewable energy.

I am concerned, based upon preliminary reports, that the administration's plan may not reflect such a balanced and farsighted perspective. Let me begin by noting the obvious—the primary, manmade cause of global warming is the burning of the very fossil fuels that power virtually the entire world.

Here is part of the power just above us as we look up to the ceiling of the Senate Chamber and see these lights. What is required, then, is the equivalent of an industrial revolution. We must develop new and cleaner technologies to burn fossil fuels as well as new methods to capture and sequester greenhouse gases, and we must develop renewable technology that is practical and cost-effective. Rarely has mankind been confronted with such a challenge—a challenge to improve how we power our economy. This is the greatest nation in the world when the issue is one of applying our engineering talents to push beyond the next incremental improvement, and, instead, visualize and then achieve major leaps forward. We can do this, if only we apply ourselves. The scale and the scope of the problem are enormous, as is the leadership that will be required by the current administration, and, for that matter, the next dozen adminis-

trations, if we are to confront and overcome this awesome challenge in our children's time and in our grandchildren's lifetime.

But this takes visionary leadership. It would take extraordinary leadership. We need more than just small, incremental increases in our domestic oil supplies or in our existing research and development programs. This is an approach which only pays lip service to the challenge that we face. It is a huge challenge. I hope that the administration's plan will take a broader view.

We must also recognize that the European Union, China, and other developing nations are quick to point the finger at us, at the world's largest contributor to global warming. We must demonstrate our resolve, and begin to get our own house in order by launching such a research and development effort, as well as continuing and expanding our current efforts to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

However, it should also be noted that China will soon surpass us as the largest emitter of greenhouse gases. The Chinese Government must stop blocking all forward movement on the question of developing country participation. The developing world is poorly served by the current level of Chinese intransigence. The poorest nations in the developing world—which will be those that are hardest hit by global warming during this century—must demand leadership from within their own ranks, and especially from China. The Chinese leadership must join us in honestly discussing solutions to the problem of climate change. The United States can develop and provide the technological breakthroughs that can be deployed by all nations, as we move forward together to solve this common, global problem.

However, I want to emphatically warn that new technologies and voluntary approaches will not by themselves solve this problem. We must also actively negotiate and ratify international agreements that include binding commitments for all of the largest emitters of greenhouse gases, if we are to have any hope of solving one of the world's—one of humanity's—greatest challenges.

This concern takes me back to the Senate's actions just 4 years ago. During the Senate floor debate over Senate Resolution 98 in July 1997, I expressed two fundamental beliefs that have guided my approach on the issue of climate change. First, while some scientific uncertainties remain, I believe that there is significant, mounting evidence that mankind is altering the world's climate. Second, the voluntary approach of the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, commonly known as the Rio Convention, has failed, as almost all of the nations of the world, including the United States, have been unable to meet their obligations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels. With those points in mind, we must ask